

REMARKS

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The final Office Action dated March 11, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-6 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,010,996 to *Hopkins et al.* (hereinafter “*Hopkins*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” *Hopkins* does not teach every element recited in claim 4. Thus, *Hopkins* cannot anticipate claim 4. To further illustrate, claim 4 recites a laundry dryer control panel which includes, among other features, a “terminal block having a lower part and an upper part,” “a first wire extending out of the terminal block lower part” and “a second wire extending out of the terminal block upper part.” *Hopkins* does not disclose these features. The Office Action alleges that *Hopkins* discloses a first wire 32 or 170 extending out of a terminal block lower part and a second wire 170 or 32 extending out of the terminal block upper part. *See e.g.*, Office Action at page 3. *Hopkins* does not disclose this. Instead, *Hopkins* illustrates one embodiment where a conductor 32 is disposed within a connector 28. *See e.g.*, col. 4, ll. 41-44 and Figure 3. Also, *Hopkins* discloses that a conductor 170 is disposed within a housing 138 which is separate from the connector 28. *See e.g.*, col. 7, ll. 3-68 and Figure 21. Thus, *Hopkins* discloses that the conductors 32 and 170 extend from different terminal blocks, they do not extend from the same terminal block, as recited in claim 4.

In addition, claim 4 recites a laundry dryer control panel which includes, among other features, a wall which “extends from the terminal block such that the wall shields an exposed portion of the first wire and the second wire.” *Hopkins* does not disclose this feature. *Hopkins* does not disclose that a first wire and a second wire have an exposed portion. Accordingly, *Hopkins* cannot disclose that a wall which extends from a terminal block shields an exposed portion of the first wire and the second wire. For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that *Hopkins* does not disclose each and every element recited in claim 4 and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claims 5 and 6, which depend from claim 4, are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,742,708 to *McCormick* (hereinafter “*McCormick*”) in view of *Hopkins*.¹ The Applicants traverse the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicants respectfully submit that neither *McCormick* nor *Hopkins*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element recited in the rejected claims. As correctly pointed out in the Office Action, *McCormick* fails to disclose “a wall for shielding an exposed part of core wire extending from an upper front portion and lower front portion.” See e.g., Office Action at page 4. As previously discussed, *Hopkins* does not disclose this feature. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that neither *McCormick* nor *Hopkins*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claim 1 and request that the

¹ The Office Action dated March 11, 2005 does not specifically indicate that claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McCormick* in view of *Hopkins*. However, Examiner Gravini indicated to the Applicants’ representative on March 15, 2005 that this is the rejection.

rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 3, which depends from claim 1, is also patentable for at least the same reason.

The Office Action also rejected claim 2 as being unpatentable over *McCormick* in view of *Hopkins* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,820,189 to *Sergeant et al.* (hereinafter “*Sergeant*”). The Applicants traverse the rejection. As previously discussed, neither *McCormick* nor *Hopkins*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claim 2 depends. Similarly, *Sergeant* fails to overcome the shortcomings of both of these references, namely “a wall for shielding an exposed part of core wire extending from an upper front portion and a lower front portion of the terminal block.” Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over *McCormick* in view of *Hopkins* in further view of *Sergeant* and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.